arXiv:1608.02509v1 [math.AT] 8 Aug 2016

HUREWICZ FIBRATIONS IN ELEMENTARY TOPOSES

KRZYSZTOF WORYTKIEWICZ

Abstract. We introduce Hurewicz fibrations and related topological notions based on elementary axiomatisations of cohesion and interval in a topos. This is enough to have a model of basic homotopy type theory. In particular, realisability toposes over partial combinatory algebras are amenable to this technique.

1. Introduction

The notion of *cohesion*, traced back to Aristotle's *Categories, Book VI* by Bell [2], has been systematically studied by Marmolejo, Menni and Lawvere in the context of toposes [11][12][13]. In it's full generality, *axomatic cohesion* is given by a structure consisting of a subcategory of *cohesive objects* and a string of adjunctions involving this subcategory. The present work is based on the arguably simplest variant of cohesion we call *connectedness*. Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a topos and $\mathbf{2} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \mathbf{1}+\mathbf{1}$ be the coproduct of the terminal with itself. An object $X \in \mathbb{T}$ is connected provided

$$\mathbf{2}^X \cong \mathbf{2}$$

Notice that this is meaningful only if $\mathbb{T}$'s logic is strictly intuitionistic, the Excluded Middle being an obstruction to connectedness in the above sense since all objects in a classical topos are disconnected.

So let us assume an intuitionistic *arithmetical* topos $\mathbb{T}$ (that is $\mathbb{T}$ comes equipped with a *natural numbers object* a.k.a. NNO). A simple condition on a connected object yields the notion of *elementary interval*. Quite surprisingly, the presence of an elementary interval is enough to have an internal notion of *Hurewicz fibrations* and other topology-like phenomena including Moore-like paths, fundamental groupoid, homotopy and strong deformation retracts. We call such a topos *Hurewicz topos*. As for the technicity involved, this author likes to think of the relevant material as a vast generalisation of van Oosten's work on the effective topos [16].

Since this work is strongly motivated by the quest of *realizability* models of *Homotopy type theory* [17], one important question to be answered is if the above notion of Hurewicz fibration is suited as a foundation to interpret *dependent types* and more generally if it is a categorical model of HoTT in some sense. So what exactly is a categorical model of HoTT? In the recent years some efforts have been directed at finding a right axiomatisation in the framework of *model categories* [1], with Voevodsky's model in the category of Kan complexes [10] as a leading example. However, it seems that not *all* the infrasture of a model category is necessary to set up a model of HoTT.

A possible answer may be found in recent unpublished work of Joyal, where he distills the necessary categorical infrastructure in his theory of *tribes* [8]. The latter are categories equipped with classes of *fibrations* verifying some stability conditions, so tribes are reminiscent yet not the same as Brown's classical *categories of fibrant objects* [3]. Joyal singles out different kinds of tribes. A *π-tribe* is a tribe with infrastructure accomodating *dependent types* while an *h-tribe* is a tribe with infrastructure accomodating formal homotopy types. Finally, a *πh-tribe* is *type-theoretical* or a *typos* (with a pinch of salt) if it verifies a further, quite natural yet technivally involved stability condition with respect

Date: August 8, 2016.

to homotopy relations in certain slices of the given πh-tribe. We show that a Hurewicz topos along with its class of Hurewicz fibrations is a type theoretical tribe.

This result does not mark the end of the game however. There remain some not uninteresting yet unsettled questions, in particular with respect to *univalence* [17] in Hurewicz toposes. We plan to address those in a sequel.

2. TOPOSES

Definition 1. A *topos* $\mathbb{T}$ is a finitely complete category such that the subobject functor

$$\mathrm{Sub}_{\mathbb{T}}(A \times -) : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbf{Set}$$

is representable for every $A \in \mathbb{T}$.

This admittingly concise definition says that $\mathbb{T}$ has *powerobjects*. This is well-known to entail a vast array of consequences, in particular

- $\mathbb{T}$ has *exponents* and *subobjects classifiers*;
- $\mathbb{T}$ *has an internal language*;
- $\mathbb{T}$ has an at least intuitionistic *internal logic*;
- and so on...

We refer the reader to [9] [14] for the lore. Notice that what we choose to call *topos* often goes under *elementary topos* in the litterature. Nonetheless, the one and only elephant in the room here is the plural of *topos*... This author advocates a multicultural approach, using *topoi* when the topoi at hand are known to be Grothendieck and *toposes* otherwise.

We briefly recall some technically relevant features of toposes, using the *internal language* technique when convenient. Fix an *arithmetical* topos $\mathbb{T}$, that is $\mathbb{T}$ comes equipped with a *natural numbers object* a.k.a. NNO. Recall that an NNO is unique up-to-iso if it exists.

Notation. *We shall write*

- $\mathbf{P}X$ *for the power-object of* X*;*
- $\boldsymbol{N}$ *for* $\mathbb{T}$*'s NNO in case* $\mathbb{T}$ *is arithmetical;*
- $U' \lhd U$ *for* $U' \in \mathbf{P}U$*, that is* U' *is the domain of a mono representing a subobject of* U*.*

Remark 1. Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{T}$. Any *bounded family* $(U_x \lhd Y)_{x \in X}$ admits a product

$$\prod_{x \in X} U_x = \{e \in Y^X | e(x) \in U_x\}$$

By virtue of Paré's theorem [15], such a family admits a coproduct $\coprod_{x \in X} U_x$ as well. The latter is a special case we shall need in what follows, yet it can be shown that all *bounded (co)limits* exist in a topos.

Remark 2. It is well-known that for any map $f : X \to Y$ in $\mathbb{T}$, the pullback functor $f^* : \mathbb{T}/Y \to \mathbb{T}/X$ has a left and a right adjoint $\sum_f \dashv f^* \dashv \prod_f$called *pushforward along* f and *product along* f respectively. In a topos, the product along f at u can be charaterised as the *object of local sections* of t over Y. A local section is given by the diagram



so the object of local sections of t over a fixed $y \in Y$ is

$$\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}_y(u) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{k \in E^{(f^{-1}(y))} | \forall x \in f^{-1}(y).(u \circ k)(x) = x\}$$

Let $\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \coprod_{y \in Y} \ell\,\mathrm{Sec}_y(u)$. We have

$$\prod_f \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle u} \\ X \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \partial(u)} \\ Y \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\partial(u)(\mathrm{in}_y(k)) = y$. The action on maps is given by postcomposition.

Remark 3. Assume $\mathbb{T}$ is arithmetical. For each $X \in \mathbb{T}$ there is the *list object over* X

$$\mathrm{List}(X) = \{x \in (1+X)^{\boldsymbol{N}} | \exists n \in \boldsymbol{N}. \forall k \in \boldsymbol{N}. (x_k \in X \Leftrightarrow k < n)\}$$

Let $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$ and

$$\mathrm{List}_n(X) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{x \in (1+X)^{\boldsymbol{N}} | \forall k \in \boldsymbol{N}. (x_k \in X \Leftrightarrow k < n)\}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{List}(X) &\cong \coprod_{n \in \boldsymbol{N}} \mathrm{List}_n(X) \\ &\cong \coprod_{n \in \boldsymbol{N}} X^n \end{aligned}$$

Notation. *We shall write* $[x_0; \cdots; x_{n-1}]$ *for a map* $x \in \mathrm{List}_n(X)$ *when convenient.*

3. Hurewicz toposes

Definition 2. Let $\mathbf{2} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1}$. $X \in \mathbb{T}$ is *connected* if $\mathbf{2}^X \cong \mathbf{2}$.

Remark 4. 1. $X \in \mathbb{T}$ is *connected* if and only if $\mathbb{T}(X, \mathbf{2}) = \{\mathrm{inl} \circ !, \mathrm{inr} \circ !\}$ where inl and inr are the coproduct injections and $! : X \to 1$ is the canonical map.
2. Let $f : A \to B$ be some map. If A is connected then so is $\mathrm{im}(f)$.
3. Given a pushout square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{v} & C \\ {\scriptstyle u}\downarrow & & \downarrow \\ B & \longrightarrow & B +_A C \end{array}$$

the object $B +_A C$ is connected if A, B and C are, for we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}(B, 1+1) &= \{\mathrm{inl} \circ !_B, \mathrm{inr} \circ !_B\} \\ \mathbb{T}(C, 1+1) &= \{\mathrm{inl} \circ !_C, \mathrm{inr} \circ !_C\} \end{aligned}$$

since B and C are connected but only

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{inl} \circ !_B \circ u &= \mathrm{inl} \circ !_C \circ v \\ \mathrm{inr} \circ !_B \circ u &= \mathrm{inr} \circ !_C \circ v \end{aligned}$$

since A is connected.

Definition 3.

1. $I \in \mathbb{T}$ is an *elementary interval* if it is connected and has precisely two distinct global elements
$$\#0, \#1 : \mathbf{1} \to I$$
such that any map $u : I \to X$ is determined by $u(\#0)$ and $u(\#1)$.
2. A *Hurewicz topos* is an elementary topos with NNO, equipped with a distinguished elementary interval.

Example 1. Any Grothendieck topos is Hurewicz.

Example 2. The *effective topos* Eff [7] is Hurewicz. The distinguished elementary interval is the assembly
$$I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \nabla[0,1] = (\{0,1\}; E(0) = \{0,1\}, E(1) = \{1,2\})$$
since there is no uniform realizer for the map
$$\begin{array}{ccc} e : I & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{2} \\ i & \mapsto & i \end{array}$$
where $i \in \{0,1\}$. Notice that in (Eff, I) an object $(X, \approx)$ is connected provided $E(x) \cap E(x') \neq \varnothing$ for all $x, x' \in X$.

Example 3. Any realisability topos over a partial combinatory algebra [4] is Hurewicz.

Example 4 (Non-example). A classical topos cannot be Hurewicz since every object is disconnected due to internal Excluded Middle.

Definition 4. Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a Hurewicz topos and I it's distinguished elementary interval. *Elementary intervals of length* n are obtained by gluing copies of I
$$\begin{array}{ccc} I_0 & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & 1 \\ I_n & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & I_{n-1} +_1 I \end{array}$$
by pushouts
$$\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & \xrightarrow{\#0} & I \\ {\scriptstyle \#n-1}\downarrow & & \downarrow \\ I_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & I_n \end{array}$$

Proposition 1. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ I_n is connected and has precisely $n+1$ global elements $\#i : \mathbf{1} \to I_n$.*

Proof. Induction on n using Remark 4. □

Corollary 1. *Any map $u : I_n \to X$ is determined by the list $[u(\#0); \cdots; u(\#n)]$.*

Corollary 2. *The set $\mathbb{T}(\mathbf{1}, I_n) = \{\#0, \cdots, \#n\}$ carries the natural total order.*

Definition 5. A map $f : I_m \to I_n$ is *monotone* provided $k \leqslant l$ implies $f(\#k) \leqslant f(\#l)$.

Remark 5. Let $\mathbb{I} \subset \mathbb{H}$ be the subcategory with objects the I_n's along with their monotone maps.

1. $\mathbb{I}$ is a monoidal category with tensor given by $I_m \oplus I_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I_{m+n-1}$.
2. $\mathbb{I}$ and the category Δ of finite ordinals and order-preserving maps are isomorphic as monoidal categories. We thus have elementary face and degeneracy operators generating $\mathbb{I}$ modulo cosimplicial identities along with a normal form theorem.

4. Fundamental groupoids in Hurewicz toposes

Fix a Hurewicz topos $\mathbb{H}$.

Notation. *Let $\sigma : I_n \to X$. We shall write σ_i for $\sigma(\#i)$.*

Definition 6. We shall call X^{I_n} the object of *rigid paths of length n*.

Remark 6. For any $X \in \mathbb{H}$ the map

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \iota_n : X^{I_n} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{List}(X) \\ \sigma & \mapsto & [\sigma_0; \cdots ; \sigma_n] \end{array}$$

is mono by Corollary 1, hence $X^{I_n} \lhd \mathrm{List}(X)$ for all $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$. In particular, the bounded coproduct $\coprod_{n\in\boldsymbol{N}} X^{I_n}$ exists. Notice that any $\sigma \in X^{I_n}$ is a list of length n whose elements belong to the same connected component.

Definition 7.

1. A rigid path $\sigma :\in X^{I_n}$ is *stutterfree* provided $\sigma_i \neq \sigma_{i+1}$ for all $0 \leqslant i < n$. It is stuttering if it is not stutterfree.
2. Let $\delta : I_m \twoheadrightarrow I_n$ be a degeneracy operator. $\sigma \in X^{I_m}$ is a δ-*expansion* of $\kappa \in X^{I_n}$ provided $\kappa \circ \delta = \sigma$ and a δ-*contraction* of $\kappa \in X^{I_n}$ provided $\sigma \circ \delta = \kappa$.
3. We say that σ is an *expansion (of κ)* if there is a rigid path $\kappa \in X^{I_n}$ and a degeneracy operator $\delta : I_m \twoheadrightarrow I_n$ such that σ a δ-expansion of κ and similarly for contractions.

Remark 7. An expansion adds stutter while a contraction reduces stutter. In particular, an expansion cannot be stutterfree while a stutterfree map does not admit any non-trivial contraction.

Definition 8. Let $X \in \mathbb{H}$ and $\sim_0$ be the relation on $\coprod_{n\in\boldsymbol{N}} X^{I_n}$ such that $\sigma \sim_0 \theta$ if and only σ is an expansion of θ. The *Hurewicz path object* $X^{\langle I\rangle}$ is the quotient

$$X^{\langle I\rangle} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \coprod_{n\in\boldsymbol{N}} X^{I_n} / \sim$$

of $\coprod_{n\in\boldsymbol{N}} X^{I_n}$ by the symmetric-transitive closure $\sim$ of $\sim_0$.

Remark 8. So what exactly does this symmetric-transitive closure? Let $\mathbb{E}_X \subseteq \mathbb{I} \downarrow X$ be the subcategory of the comma category $\mathbb{I}$ above X with only degeneracy operators as maps. Equivalence classes in $X^{\langle I\rangle}$ are connected components of $\mathbb{E}_X$ (in the categorical sense), so $\sigma \sim \theta$ if and only if there is some κ such that σ and θ are contractions of κ (so κ is a common expansion of σ and θ) or they are expansions of κ (so κ is a common contraction of σ and θ). Hence by Remark 7 any $[\sigma] \in X^{\langle I\rangle}$ has a canonical stutterfree representative $\hat{\sigma}$ and all other representatives are expansions of $\hat{\sigma}$.

Notation. *From now on we shall write $\sigma \in X^{\langle I\rangle}$, formally blurring the distinction between a path and some representative, yet the former is almost always clear from context as any two representatives of the same path differ only by the amount of stutter. We shall write $\sigma^{(n)}$ for a path given by a representative of length n.*

Remark 9. In a Hurewicz topos, *path-connectedness* (by Hurewicz paths) and *connectedness* are equivalent notions.

Definition 9. A path $\sigma \in X^{\langle I\rangle}$ is *constant* if its canonical representative $\hat{\sigma}$ is of length 0.

Remark 10. A length-zero representative of a path σ is a global element $\hat{\sigma} : I_0 \to X$ through which factors any other representative. So $\hat{\sigma}$ is an empty list such that for any expansion $\theta \in X^{I_n}$ of $\hat{\sigma}$ we have $\theta_i = \theta_j$ for all $0 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n$.

Remark 11. Let $\rho \in X^{I_m}$, $\rho' \in X^{I_n}$. Assume $\delta : I_m \twoheadrightarrow I_n$ is a degeneracy operator such that ρ is a δ-expansion of ρ'. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_m &= (\rho' \circ \delta)_m \\ &= \rho'_n \\ \rho_0 &= (\rho' \circ \delta)_0 \\ &= \rho'_0 \end{aligned}$$

so expansions preserve endpoints. Hence the source and target maps $s, t : X^{\langle I \rangle} \to X$ given by evaluations $s(\sigma^{(m)}) = \sigma_0^{(m)}$ and $t(\sigma^{(m)}) = \sigma_m^{(m)}$ are well-defined by Remark 8, so $s, t : X^{\langle I \rangle} \rightrightarrows X$ is an internal graph in $\mathbb{H}$.

Definition 10. Let $\sigma \in X^{I_m}$ and $\theta \in X^{I_n}$ be rigid paths such that $\sigma_m = \theta_0$. The map $\sigma \oplus \theta \in X^{I_m \oplus I_n}$ is given by

$$(\sigma \oplus \theta)_i \overset{\text{def.}}{=} \begin{cases} \sigma_i & i \leqslant m \\ \theta_{i-m+1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.

1. *$X^{\langle I \rangle} \rightrightarrows X$ is an internal category with*
   - *i. composition $\oplus : X^{\langle I \rangle} \times_X X^{\langle I \rangle} \to X^{\langle I \rangle}$ given by $\sigma^{(m)} \oplus \theta^{(n)}$;*
   - *ii. identity $c : X \to X^{\langle I \rangle}$ given by a constant path $c(x)$ for any $x \in X$;*
2. *This category is a groupoid, X's* fundamental groupoid*, with inverses given by*
$$(\sigma^{(n)})_i^{-1}(i) = \sigma_{n-i}^{(n)}$$
3. *The assignment $(-)^{\langle I \rangle} : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{H}$ is a functor acting on paths by postcomposition:*
$$f^{\langle I \rangle}(\sigma) = f \circ \sigma$$
4. *The maps c, s and t are natural.*

Proof. Assume $\sigma^{(m)} \sim \kappa^{(p)}$ and $\theta^{(n)} \sim \psi^{(q)}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma^{(m)} \oplus \theta^{(n)}} &= \widehat{\sigma^{(m)}} \oplus \widehat{\theta^{(n)}} \\ &= \widehat{\kappa^{(p)}} \oplus \widehat{\psi^{(q)}} \\ &= \widehat{\kappa^{(p)} \oplus \psi^{(q)}} \end{aligned}$$

so composition of paths is well-defined. The other items are ticked off by similar considerations involving stutter. □

Remark 12. Notice that Hurewicz paths mimick the behavior of topological Moore paths.

Notation. *We shall write $\sigma : x \rightsquigarrow x'$ as an abbreviation for a path $\sigma \in X^{\langle I \rangle}$ such that $s(\sigma) = x$ and $t(\sigma) = y$. Let $u : X \to Y$ be a map. We shall write $u(\sigma) : u(x) \rightsquigarrow u(x')$ for $u^{\langle I \rangle}(\sigma)$ as $s \circ u^{\langle I \rangle} = u \circ s$ and $t \circ u^{\langle I \rangle} = u \circ t$ by naturality.*

Definition 11. Let $f, g : X \to Y$ be maps. A *homotopy* $H : f \looparrowright g$ from f to g is given by a commuting diagram



H is *constant* on a subobject $X' \lhd X$ if $H(x) = c(x)$ for all $x \in X'$.

Remark 13. A homotopy $H : f \looparrowright g$ in a Hurewicz topos means that for any $x \in X$ we have a path $H(x) : f(x) \rightsquigarrow g(x)$.

Definition 12. A homotopy equivalence is a map $u : X \to Y$ which has an up-to-homotopy inverse $v : Y \to X$.

Remark 14. The map v is a homotopy equivalence as well, called *the inverse homotopy equivalence*.

5. Hurewicz Fibrations

Definition 13. A section h of the canonical map $\langle f^{\langle I \rangle}, s_X \rangle_Y$ in



is called *Hurewicz connection*. A map which admits a Hurewicz connection is called *Hurewicz fibration*.

Notation. *We shall write $\mathcal{H}$ for the class of Hurewicz fibrations.*

Remark 15. A Hurewicz fibration $f : X \to Y$ is thus a map with a path lifiting property: for any path $\sigma : y \rightsquigarrow y'$ in Y and any $x \in X$ such that $f(x) = y$ there is a path θ in X such that $f \circ \theta = \sigma$



Lemma 1. *Hurewicz fibrations are stable under composition.*

Proof. Simple diagram chase, given that sections are preserved by pullback. □

Proposition 2.

1. *Any projection from a product is a Hurewicz fibration.*
2. *$\langle s, t \rangle : X^{\langle I \rangle} \to X \times X$ is a Hurewicz fibration for any $X \in \mathbb{H}$.*
3. *The source map $s : X^{\langle I \rangle} \to X$ and the target map $t : X^{\langle I \rangle} \to X$ are Hurewicz fibrations.*

Proof. 1. Assume $\pi_1 : X \times Y \to X$, $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ and $\sigma : x \rightsquigarrow x'$ a path in X. There is the obvious path $\bar{\sigma} : (x, y) \rightsquigarrow (x', y)$ which is constant in the second coordinate.

2. Assume $\sigma \in X^{\langle I \rangle}$, $x = s(\sigma)$, $y = t(\sigma)$ and a path $\theta : (x, y) \rightsquigarrow (x', y')$ of length 1. We then have paths of lenght 1 $\theta_1 : x \rightsquigarrow x'$ in X and $\theta_2 : y \rightsquigarrow y'$ in Y. But then we have the path
$$\bar{\theta} = \theta_2 \circ \sigma \circ \theta_1^{-1}$$
with $s(\bar{\theta}) = x'$ and $t(\bar{\theta}) = y'$. Since a path of any length is a composition of paths of length 1, the assertion follows by induction.

3. We have $s = \pi_1 \circ \langle s, t\rangle$ and $t = \pi_2 \circ \langle s, t\rangle$, so the assertion follows by Lemma 1.

□

Definition 14. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be a category with finite limits.

1. A class of maps $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_1$ is a class of *fibrations* provided it contains all isos and is stable under composition as well as under base change.
2. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_1$ be a class of *fibrations*. An object $X \in \mathbb{C}$ is *fibrant* if $!_X : X \to \mathbf{1}$ is a fibration.
3. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_1$ be a class of *fibrations*. $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$ is a *tribe* provided every object $X \in \mathbb{C}$ is fibrant.

Lemma 2. *Hurewicz fibrations are stable under pullback.*

Proof. Let $f : A \to B$ be an arbitrary map and $p : E \to B$ be Hurewicz fibration. Assume

$$(a, e) \in f^*E = \{(a, e) \in A \times E | f(a) = p(e)\}$$

along with a path $\sigma : a \rightsquigarrow a'$ in A. Hence there is a path $f(\sigma) : f(a) \rightsquigarrow f(a')$ in B. Now p is Hurewicz by hypothesis, so this path can be lifted to a path $\overline{f(\sigma)}$ in E such that $p(\overline{f(\sigma)}) = f(\sigma)$, which means that $\overline{f(\sigma)}$ factors through f^*E. □

Remark 16. $c_X : X \to X^{\langle I\rangle}$ is a section of $s_X : X^{\langle I\rangle} \to X$.

Lemma 3. *Any object $X \in \mathbb{H}$ is Hurewicz fibrant.*

Proof. We need to find section h of the canonical map $\langle !^{\langle I\rangle}, s_X\rangle_{\mathbf{1}}$



Now $\mathbf{1}^{\langle I\rangle} \cong \mathbf{1}$ since $\sigma \in \mathbf{1}^{\langle I\rangle} \Rightarrow \sigma = c(*)$, so $\mathbf{1}^{\langle I\rangle} \times_{\mathbf{1}} X \cong X$ hence the assertion follows by Remark 16. □

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a Hurewicz topos and $\mathcal{H}$ it's class of Hurewicz fibrations. $(\mathbb{H}, \mathcal{H})$ is a tribe.*

Proof. Any iso obviously is a Hurewicz fibration. The assertion follows thus by Lemma 1, Lemma 2 and Lemma 3. □

Definition 15. We shall call $(\mathbb{H}, \mathcal{H})$ a *Hurewicz tribe*.

Definition 16. A *locally cartesian closed category* or LCCC is a category with finite limits such that every slice is cartesian closed.

Remark 17. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be a category with finite limits. It is well-known that the following are equivalent

i. $\mathbb{C}$ is an LCCC;
ii. The change of base functor $f^* : B \to A$ has a right adjoint $\prod_f : A \to B$ for any $f : A \to B$ in $\mathbb{C}$.

Definition 17. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be an LCCC. A tribe $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$ is a π-tribe provided $\prod_f(E, p)$ is again a fibration given any fibrations $p : E \to A$ and $f : A \to B$.

Remark 18. The above definition is a particular case of Joyal's original one.

Example 5.

1. Small groupoids with Grothendieck fibrations [6].

2. Kan complexes with Kan fibrations [10].
3. Type theory terms with display maps [5].

Lemma 4. *Let $p : D \to Z$ be a Hurewicz fibration, $K \subseteq D$ a connected component of D and $\delta : z \rightsquigarrow z'$ a path in X. The following are equivalent*

i. $f^{-1}(z) \cap K \neq \varnothing$;
ii. $f^{-1}(z') \cap K \neq \varnothing$

Proof. We can lift both ways since Hurewicz paths are taken in an object's fundamental groupoid:



□

Theorem 3. *Any Hurewicz tribe is a π-tribe.*

Proof. We need to show that given Hurewicz fibrations $p, f \in \mathbb{H}_1$, $\prod_f(p)$ is again a Hurewicz fibration. But a path $\delta : y \rightsquigarrow y'$ in Y can be lifted to a path of sections:



since there is the sequence of lifts



connected component by connected component. Notice that we don't miss any element of the fiber of y' by Lemma 4. □

6. Anodyne maps

Definition 18. X is a *strong deformation retract of* Y if there is a map $e : X \to Y$ admitting a retraction $r : Y \to X$ such that there is a homotopy $H : \mathrm{id}_Y \rightsquigarrow e \circ r$ constant on X (see Definition 11). We call the split epi r *strong deformation retraction* and the split mono e *strong deformation insertion*, respectively.

Remark 19. A strong deformation insertion is a homotopy equivalence.

Definition 19. Let $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$ be a tribe. A morphism in $\mathbb{C}$ is anodyne provided $c \in^{\pitchfork} \mathcal{F}$.

Proposition 3. *A strong deformation insertion is anodyne in it's Hurewicz tribe.*

Proof. We claim that there is a lift $d : A \to E$ in any commuting diagram



Let $r : A \to A'$ be a strong deformation retraction such that $r \circ i = \mathrm{id}_{A'}$. We have by hypothesis a homotopy $H : i \circ r \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{id}_A$, so there is a path $H(a) : (i \circ r)(a) \rightsquigarrow a$ and therefore a path

$$v(H(a)) : (v \circ i \circ r)(a) \rightsquigarrow v(a)$$

for each $a \in A$. Since the square commutes we have $(v \circ i \circ r)(a) = (f \circ u \circ r)(a)$. But f is a Hurewicz fibration by hypothesis, so we can lift $v(H(a))$ to a path $\overline{v(H(a))} : (u \circ r)(a) \rightsquigarrow e$. This determines a lift $d(a) \overset{\text{def}}{=} t(\overline{v(H(a))})$. We have $f \circ d = v$ by construction and $d \circ i = u$ since H is constant on A'. □

Definition 20. Let $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$ be a tribe. A $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$-*tribal path object* for $A \in \mathbb{C}$ is an object $\mathbb{P}A \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the diagonal map $\Delta : A \to A \times A$ factors through $\mathbb{P}A$ in an anodyne map followed by a fibration. A homotopy with respect to a path object is called *path homotopy*.

Definition 21. A *truncation operator* $\tau_{m,i} : I_{m-i} \rightarrowtail I_m$ is an iteration of *last face operators*, that is face operators $\varphi_k : I_k \rightarrowtail I_{k+1}$ such that $\varphi_k(\#i) = \#i$ for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k$.

Lemma 5. *The constant path map $c_X : X \to X^{\langle I \rangle}$ is a strong deformation insertion.*

Proof. By Remark 16, c_X is a section of s_X. It is not hard to see that $c_X \circ s_X \simeq \mathrm{id}_{X^{\langle I \rangle}}$ by a *folding* homotopy $H : X^{\langle I \rangle} \to X^{\langle I \rangle^{\langle I \rangle}}$. Explicitely, $H(\sigma) : \sigma \rightsquigarrow (c_X \circ s_X)(\sigma)$ is a path of paths given for any $\sigma^{(m)} \in X^{\langle I \rangle}$ by successive truncations of σ

$$H(\sigma^{(m)})_i \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sigma^{(m)} \circ \tau_{m,i}$$

□

Proposition 4. *A Hurewicz path object $X^{\langle I \rangle}$ is $(\mathbb{H}, \mathcal{H})$-tribal for any $X \in \mathbb{H}$.*

Proof. There is the obvious factorisation of the diagonal map



The assertion follows by Lemma 5. □

Definition 22. Let $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$ be a tribe equipped with a tribal path object for any $X \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f : X \to Y$ be a map in $\mathbb{C}$. The object M_f given by the pullback



is called f's *mapping track*.

Proposition 5 (Joyal)**.** *Any map $f : X \to Y$ factors through the mapping track M_f as $f = h \circ s$ with s anodyne and h a fibration.*

Remark 20. The factorisation of proposition 5 is given by

$$a \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle \mathrm{id}, c \rangle$$
$$h \overset{\text{def}}{=} t \circ p_2$$

In a Hurewicz tribe $(x,\sigma) \in M_f$ is a path $\sigma \in Y^{\langle I \rangle}$ such that it's source is $f(x)$, so $M_f \lhd Y^{\langle I \rangle}$ is the subobject of paths having their source in the image of f. In particular, $(x,(c \circ f)(x)) \in M_f$ for all $x \in X$. Now p_1 is a retraction of a by construction and a strong deformation retraction by a retracting homotopy, so a is a strong deformation insertion. Let $(x,\sigma) \in M_f$ so $\sigma : f(x) \rightsquigarrow y$ for some $y \in Y$ and $(t \circ p_2)(x,\sigma) = y$. A path $\theta^{(m)} : y \rightsquigarrow y'$ in Y has a lift $\overline{\theta^{(m)}} : (x,\sigma) \rightsquigarrow (x',\sigma')$ given by successive postcompostions with initial segments of θ

$$\overline{\theta^{(m)}}_i \quad = \quad \sigma \circ \theta^{(m)} \circ \tau_{m,m-i}$$

Definition 23. Let $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ be a tribe. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_1$ be the class of anodyne morphisms. The tribe $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ is *homotopical* or an *h-tribe* provided

i. $(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{F})$ is a factorisation system;
ii. anodyne morphisms are stable under base change along a fibration.

Proposition 6 (Joyal)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ be a π-tribe and $\mathcal{A}$ it's class of anodyne morphisms. If $(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{F})$ is a factorisation system then $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ is homotopical.*

Example 6.

1. Small groupoids with Grothendieck fibrations.
2. Kan complexes with Kan fibrations.
3. Type theory terms with display maps.

Theorem 4. *A π-tribe equipped with a tribal path object is homotopical.*

Proof. The assertion follows from Joyal's work by Proposition 5 and proposition 6. □

Corollary 3. *Any Hurewicz tribe is homotopical.*

7. Local homotopy

Definition 24. Let $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ be a tribe, $A \in \mathbb{C}$, and $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{C}/A$ be the full subcategory with all the objects fibrations. A map

$$f : \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle u} \\ A \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} F \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle q} \\ A \end{pmatrix}$$

is a fibration in $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$ provided $f \in \mathcal{F}$ seen as a map in $\mathbb{C}$.

Notation. *We shall write $\mathcal{F}_A$ for the class of fibrations in $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$.*

Proposition 7 (Joyal)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ be a tribe and $A \in \mathbb{C}$. $(\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A),\mathcal{F}_A)$ is a tribe, called* local tribe.

Proposition 8 (Joyal)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ be a π-tribe and $A \in \mathbb{C}$.*

1. *The local tribe $(\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A),\mathcal{F}_A)$ is a π-tribe.*
2. *For any $f : A \to B$ the functors f^* and $\prod_f$ restrict to local tribes and we have the adjunction*

$$f^* \dashv \prod_f : \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(B) \to \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$$

Proposition 9 (Joyal)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ be a homotopical tribe and $A \in \mathbb{C}$. The local tribe $(\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A),\mathcal{F}_A)$ is homotopical.*

Remark 21. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be a category with finite limits. Recall that the product in a slice $\mathbb{C}/A$ then exists and is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle u} \\ A \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} F \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle v} \\ A \end{pmatrix} \quad = \quad \begin{pmatrix} E \times_A F \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle u*v} \\ A \end{pmatrix}$$

along with

$$\pi_1 = p_1 : \begin{pmatrix} E \times_A F \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u*v} \to \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u}$$

$$\pi_2 = p_2 : \begin{pmatrix} E \times_A F \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u*v} \to \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{2}$$

calculated in $\mathbb{C}$ as



In particular, the diagonal map $\Delta_u : \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u} \to \begin{pmatrix} E \times_A E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u*u}$ over A is given by



Remark 22. Let $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$ be a tribe. A map $f : \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u} \to \begin{pmatrix} F \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{q}$ is anodyne in $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$ if it is anodyne with respect to $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$, yet the converse implication does not need to hold.

Remark 23. Let $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{F})$ be a homotopical tribe and $\mathbb{P}A$ be a tribal path object for A. Let

$$\begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u} \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$$

The diagonal map

$$\Delta_u : \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u} \to \begin{pmatrix} E \times_A E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u*u}$$

factors as $\Delta_u = \langle s, t \rangle_u \circ e_u$ with the maps $\langle s, t \rangle_u : \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_A E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{(u*u)\circ\langle s,t\rangle_A} \to \begin{pmatrix} E \times_A E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u*u}$ and $e_u : \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u} \to \begin{pmatrix} E \times_A E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{u*u}$ given by



Hence the object

$$\begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow u \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{\langle I \rangle} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_A E \\ \downarrow (u*u)\circ\langle s,t\rangle_A \\ A \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$$

is a tribal path object in the local tribe $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$. We shall call such path objects *locally tribal*. The source and target maps of a locally tribal path object are given by

$$s_A = p_1 \circ \langle s,t\rangle_A : \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_A E \\ \downarrow (u*u)\circ\langle s,t\rangle_A \\ A \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow u \\ A \end{pmatrix}$$

$$t_A = p_2 \circ \langle s,t\rangle_A : \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_A E \\ \downarrow (u*u)\circ\langle s,t\rangle_A \\ A \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow u \\ A \end{pmatrix}$$

Example 7.

1. Small groupoids with Grothendieck fibrations.
2. Kan complexes with Kan fibrations.
3. Type theory terms with display maps.

Remark 24. Let $(\mathbb{H}, \mathcal{H})$ be a Hurewicz tribe. Unravelling the above construction of locally tribal path objects yields in this case



so

$$\begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow u \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{\langle I \rangle} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_u E \\ \downarrow u\circ s \\ A \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$$

is a locally tribal path object. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_u E &= \{((e_1,e_2),\theta) \in (E \times_A E) \times E^{\langle I \rangle} | \theta : e_1 \rightsquigarrow e_2\} \\ &\cong \{\theta \in E^{\langle I \rangle} | (u\circ s)(\theta) = (u \circ t)(\theta)\} \end{aligned}$$

hence $\Omega_u E \lhd E^{\langle I \rangle}$ is the subobject of those paths in E which are mapped on loops by u[1]. We have in particular an alternative structural map, that is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Omega_u E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u\circ s} = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_u E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u\circ t}$$

Notice that

$$\langle s,t\rangle_u = \langle s,t\rangle_{|\Omega_u E}$$

so

$$s_u = s_{|\Omega_u E} : \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_u E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u\circ s} \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u}$$

$$t_u = t_{|\Omega_u E} : \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_u E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u\circ s} \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u}$$

Remark 25. Let $f : A \to B$ be a Hurewicz fibration and $\begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u} \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_f \left(\begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u}^{\langle I \rangle} \right) &= \prod_f \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_u E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u\circ s} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u\circ s) \\ \downarrow \\ B \end{pmatrix}_{\partial(u\circ s)} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}_b(u\circ s) = \{k \in (\Omega_u E)^{f^{-1}(b)} \,|\, \forall a \in f^{-1}(b).(u\circ s\circ k)(a) = a\}$$

(see Remark 2) so a local section $k \in \ell\,\mathrm{Sec}_b(u\circ s)$ maps any $a \in f^{-1}(b)$ on a path in E over an a-based loop in A.

Remark 26. Let $f : A \to B$ be a Hurewicz fibration and $\begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u} \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_f \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}_{u} \right)^{\langle I \rangle} &= \begin{pmatrix} \ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u) \\ \downarrow \\ B \end{pmatrix}_{\partial(u)}^{\langle I \rangle} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{\partial(u)}(\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u)) \\ \downarrow \\ B \end{pmatrix}_{\partial(u)\circ s} \end{aligned}$$

[1]The bit of notation "Ω" tries to suggest here a loop space of sorts, nothing to do with a subobject classifier...

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{\partial(u)}(\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u)) &= \Omega_{\partial(u)}\coprod_{b\in B}\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}_b(u)\\ &= \Omega_{\partial(u)}\coprod_{b\in B}\{k\in E^{(f^{-1}(b))}|\forall a\in f^{-1}(b).(u\circ k)(a)=a\}\end{aligned}$$

so a path of local sections $\kappa\in\Omega_{\partial(u)}(\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u))$ starts and ends in the component with the same tag.

Remark 27. Let $f:A\to B$ be a Hurewicz fibration and $\begin{pmatrix} E\\ \downarrow\ {\scriptstyle u}\\ A\end{pmatrix}\in\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$. Assume $l\in\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u\circ s)$ so there is a unique $b\in B$ such that $l\in\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}_b(u\circ s)$. Hence, by Remark 25, $l(a)$ is a path in E over an a-based loop in A. Sending this loop to its basepoint yields a map

$$\mathrm{bpt}_u:\begin{pmatrix}\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u\circ s)\\ \downarrow\\ B\end{pmatrix}^{\partial(u\circ s)}\longrightarrow\begin{pmatrix}\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u)\\ \downarrow\\ B\end{pmatrix}^{\partial(u)}$$

given by $\mathrm{bpt}_u(l)\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\cdot\ s\circ l$ where $s:\Omega_uE\to E$ is the source map. By remark 26 the postcomposition of this map with the constant path map $c_u:\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u)\to\Omega_{\partial(u)}(\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u))$ yields a map

$$c_u\circ\mathrm{bpt}_u:\begin{pmatrix}\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u\circ s)\\ \downarrow\\ B\end{pmatrix}^{\partial(u\circ s)}\longrightarrow\begin{pmatrix}\Omega_{\partial(u)}(\ell\,\mathrm{Sec}(u))\\ \downarrow\\ B\end{pmatrix}^{\partial(u)\circ s}$$

The latter makes everything in sight commute in the diagram



Definition 25. A homotopical π-tribe $(\mathbb{C},\mathcal{F})$ is *type-theoretical* provided the product functor

$$\prod_f:\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)\to\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(B)$$

preserves the local homotopy relation for every fibration $f:A\to B$.

Theorem 5. *Any Hurewicz tribe is type-theoretical.*

Proof. Let $(\mathbb{H}, \mathcal{H})$ be a Hurewicz tribe, $f : A \to B$ be a Hurewicz fibration and

$$p, q : \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \downarrow \ {\scriptstyle u} \\ A \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} F \\ \downarrow \ {\scriptstyle v} \\ A \end{pmatrix}$$

be maps in $\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$. Assume a homotopy $H : p \twoheadrightarrow q$. The diagram


$\prod_f \begin{pmatrix} E^u \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}$
$\prod_f(p)$
$\prod_f(H)$
$\prod_f(q)$
$\prod_f \begin{pmatrix} F^v \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}$
$\prod_f \left(\begin{pmatrix} F^v \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}^{\langle I \rangle} \right)$
$\prod_f \begin{pmatrix} F^v \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix}$
$\prod_f\left(s_{|\Omega_u F}\right)$
$\prod_f\left(t_{|\Omega_u F}\right)$
$c_v \circ \mathrm{bpt}_v$
$t_{|\Omega_{\partial(v)}(\ell \mathrm{Sec}(v))}$
$t_{|\Omega_{\partial(v)}(\ell \mathrm{Sec}(v))}$
$\left(\prod_f \begin{pmatrix} F^v \\ \downarrow \\ A \end{pmatrix} \right)^{\langle I \rangle}$

commutes by functoriality and Remark 27 so the homotopy

$$c_v \circ_{\mathrm{bpt}_v} \circ \prod_f(H) : \prod_f(p) \quad \twoheadrightarrow \quad \prod_f(q)$$

witnesses the fact that the homotopy relation is preserved by $\prod_f$. □

References

[1] Steve Awodey and Michael A Warren. Homotopy theoretic models of identity types. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 146, pages 45–55. Cambridge Univ Press, 2009.

[2] John L Bell. Cohesiveness. *Intellectica*, (51):145–168, 2009.

[3] Kenneth S Brown. Abstract homotopy theory and generalized sheaf cohomology. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 186:419–458, 1973.

[4] Erwin Engeler. Algebras and combinators. *Algebra universalis*, 13(1):389–392, 1981.

[5] Nicola Gambino and Richard Garner. The identity type weak factorisation system. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 409(1):94–109, 2008.

[6] Martin Hofmann and Thomas Streicher. The groupoid interpretation of type theory. *Twenty-five years of constructive type theory (Venice, 1995)*, 36:83–111, 1998.

[7] J Martin E Hyland. The effective topos. *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, 110:165–216, 1982.

[8] André Joyal. Categorical homotopy type theory. *Slides from a talk at MIT dated*, 17, 2014.

[9] Peter T Johnstone. *Sketches of an elephant: A topos theory compendium*, volume 2. Oxford University Press, 2002.

[10] K Kapulkin, PL Lumsdaine and V Voevodsky. The simplicial model of univalent foundations (2012, preprint). *ArXiv preprint arXiv:1211.2851*, 82.

[11] F William Lawvere. Cohesive toposes and cantor's' lauter einsen'. *Philosophia Mathematica*, 2(1):5–15, 1994.

[12] F William Lawvere. Axiomatic cohesion. *Theory Appl. Categ*, 19(3):41–49, 2007.

[13] F Marmolejo and M Menni. On the relation between continuous and combinatorial. *Journal of Homotopy and Related Structures*, :1–34, 2016.

[14] Saunders MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in geometry and logic: A first introduction to topos theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
[15] Robert Paré. Colimits in topoi. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 80(3):556–561, 1974.
[16] Jaap Van Oosten. A notion of homotopy for the effective topos. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 25(05):1132–1146, 2015.
[17] Vladimir Voevodsky et al. Homotopy type theory: univalent foundations of mathematics. *Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton), The Univalent Foundations Program*, , 2013.